

LP
F
5012
1871
K
2.1

Queen's University Libraries



3 9004 00150700 0

Queen's University
Library

KINGSTON, ONTARIO

THREE LECTURES

DELIVERED IN THE

CATHEDRAL OF ST. GEORGE,

KINGSTON,

IN ADVENT 1869,

BY

THE BISHOP OF ONTARIO.

Montreal :

PRINTED BY JOHN LOVELL, ST. NICHOLAS STREET.
1871.

THREE LECTURES

DELIVERED IN THE

CATHEDRAL OF ST. GEORGE,

KINGSTON,

IN ADVENT 1869,

BY

THE BISHOP OF ONTARIO.

Montreal:

PRINTED BY JOHN LOVELL, ST. NICHOLAS STREET.
1871.

L
F5012

1871 K

“For thus saith the LORD ; David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the House of Israel, neither shall the priests the Levites want a man before me to offer burnt offerings, and to kindle meat offerings, and to do sacrifice continually.”—Jer. xxxiii. 17-18.

LECTURES.

DISCOURSE I.

“ For whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning.”—ROM. xv. 4.

ST. PAUL is here reminding the Christian Jews at Rome of the value of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and our Liturgy, by the appointment of a special Collect for the right understanding of the Scriptures, would remind us to-day of the same thing. Nothing seems to puzzle most Bible readers more than the difficulty of deciding when to quote the Old Testament on behalf of their theories. When by precept or example, it seems to make for their peculiarities, men say, “ Whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning ;” but when the precept or example appears to make against their favorite tenets, men say, “ old things are passed away, all things are become new.” Christians, at different periods of the Church’s history, have rushed into the extremes of disparaging or idolizing Old Testament Scripture. Two

of the oldest heresies were the Marcionite and the Manichæan, which made light of the Old Testament, while the modern Puritans deemed its precepts and precedents so literally binding that, under colour of its sanction, they justified what many think to be shocking enormities. On one point we should all agree: "That whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning," but it is to be feared that few possess the humility of the Ethiopian who when asked, "Understandest thou what thou readest?" replied to St. Philip "How can I, unless some man should guide me?" Perhaps, too, we should agree in affirming that faithful prayer such as that of the Collect for to-day's Service, is most necessary, in order that we may secure the blessings of true learning; but it is not at all so obvious that there is need for exertion, earnest and intellectual; and yet we may be assured that unless there be a judicious combination of prayer and study, we shall remain blind to the teachings of the old oracles of God.

My purpose is not to attempt to lay down rules, or to refer you to guides for the right understanding of the drift and scope of the Mosaic or Prophetical Scriptures. That would be too vast a topic. I shall rather dwell upon one strong fact, which, the more it is considered, the more important it will appear, namely: that without a knowledge of the Old Testament, the New Testament must be absolutely

unintelligible. Here is the true motive to *learn* the Old Testament. The more a man is imbued with the spirit of the Old Testament, and the more he can enter into the habits and customs, the rites and ceremonies, the civil and religious government of the Jews, the more truly can he see the meaning and understand the force of the New Testament Revelation. Without this preparatory training, the significance as well as the beauty of New Testament language is in a great measure lost. Many passages cannot be understood in a theological sense, unless they are first understood in an archæological one. “*Non possunt intelligi theologicè, nisi prius intelligantur archæologicè.*” Next to an accurate knowledge of Jewish archæology, nothing would aid a student of the New Testament so much as to read it under the guidance and tuition of a scholarly Jew. A flood of light would thus be poured upon the doctrines and discipline of the Kingdom of Christ—the Church. What marvellous associations cluster round that word—Church! What deeds of heroism, what sufferings and joys unspeakable; what magnificent institutions; what immortal literature, are due to the Society called the Church! And yet, Christians are sadly divided regarding its nature and organization, though they agree, indeed, in saying that no description of its structure can be the right one, unless it correspond with the accounts given in the earliest Christian Writings, the New Testament.

Hence, every Christian denomination arrogates to itself the honorable title of Scriptural Church. Every sect thinks that its organization exhibits this required correspondence, and it therefore follows that the New Testament was meant to be so elastic as to be capable of many interpretations, or at all events, not so definite as to demand that all men should be required to read it in the same light. But this supposition is derogatory to the inspired authors of these Writings, and a thoughtful man will suspect that the fault lies with the readers of the books, and not with the writers, and the fact is so. Most readers study the Sacred Writings with so many prepossessions in favor of their own ecclesiastical system, and therefore strain them so violently, that they are unconsciously deceived. But besides this prejudice, there is also what is equally blinding, an ignoring of the Old Testament. The value of the Old Testament will appear while we offer some considerations, which, though little thought of, may help us to form an enlightened opinion on the meaning of New Testament language generally when it speaks of Church organization. And in very deed we should pray the more earnestly "That we may read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest the Scriptures" which bear upon the formation and structure of the Body of Christ ; because, could Christians agree on this point, the greatest step towards the blessing of unity would be taken.

A fallacy which besets many who seek for a description of the visible Church in the New Testament is that of supposing Christianity to be altogether a new religion ; just as some people are persuaded that because great changes were made at the Reformation, the Church of England is a new Church, or at least so far a modern one, that her previous history, literature and ritual are of no account, so multitudes imagine that Christianity, though originating in Judaism, yet, after its birth, owed nothing to it, or was wholly independent of its influence. Accordingly, they fail to see the consequences of what really is the fact, that Christianity and Judaism are substantially one—the same religion in different historical stages. Christianity is Judaism in its perfection, and Judaism was Christianity in its infancy. The great difference between the two periods of the same religion is, that Judaism was prospective, and therefore dimly prophetic; Christianity is retrospective, and therefore brightly historical. The one was ever looking forward to him who was to come “to be the glory of His people, Israel;” the other has been looking back to Him who came “to be a light to lighten the Gentiles.” There ought not, in fact, to be a blank page between the Old and New Testaments. The only separation between them is one of time. But time should no more disconnect the Prophet Malachi and St. Matthew, than it should disconnect Genesis and Exodus.

St. Matthew takes up the thread where Malachi dropped it, and records how the Prophecy, "Behold I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me," was fulfilled in those days when "John the Baptist came preaching in the wilderness of Judea." His preaching was not that of one bidding the Jews to look forward to the destruction of the Church, but to its perfection; his theme was God's ability to enlarge it by "raising up children unto Abraham." St. Matthew and St. Luke take care to unite the two dispensations by the link of Christ's genealogy; the one prefixing it to the history of His natural, the other to the history of His ministerial life. St. Paul never supposed that his conversion, though it opened his eyes and turned him from darkness to light, had transferred him into a new Church. We find St. Paul at Antioch, and St. Stephen at Jerusalem, commencing their arguments for conversion, by a *recapitulation* of Jewish Church history, to show how intimate the union was between the old and new dispensations. They sum up the past history of Judaism to show that its natural issue was in "Him whom they knew not, nor yet the voices of the Prophets which were read every Sabbath day," and that the transition from the Jewish to the Christian stage of the one Church was most easy, natural and philosophical. Throughout the epistles we find that St. Paul's leading idea was that Christianized Gentiles are the true sons of faithful Abraham.

“If,” says he, “ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed;”^a and again, “We, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of Promise.”^b These are passages which prove that converted Gentiles were considered by St. Paul as children “raised up unto Abraham,” who understood their true position in the Church in consequence of the coming of Christ. Our Lord himself also taught that there should be eventually “one flock and one Shepherd,” and he plainly stated that His office was to “bring” the Gentiles to the fold, and “that they should sit down with Abraham and Isaac in the Kingdom of God;” or, in other words, the Gentiles were to be added to the parent stock of the existing Church, and as St. Paul says, be ^c “grafted in as a wild olive tree;” admitted as ^d “fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ.” The *Ecclesia* of the New Dispensation was not then a novel Institution recruited out of Jews and Gentiles, but was the *Ecclesia* of God which had existed from the beginning, only developed and spiritualized. We can point to the date when this Catholic and spiritualizing process began, that is to the Baptism of Cornelius, and the day of Pentecost; we can fix the time when the Priesthood was changed, necessitating a change of law,^e namely, when, Christ breathed upon the Apostles, commissioned them, and ascended into heaven; but all

^a Gal. iii. 29. ^b Gal. vi. 28.

^c Rom. xi. 17. ^d Eph. iii. 6. ^e Heb. vii. 1.

these things took place in the existing Church of God, according to Prophecies, the record of which was part of the Church's law, and entrusted to the Church's officers. In other words, the Church of God in the Old Testament was not a *type* only of the Church of Christ in the New, but was that Church itself—one with it in identity and continuity, the true members of it “dying in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them;” or, more forcibly and literally, “having seen and *saluted* them from afar.” St. Paul is explicit on this point. In one place¹ he asserts “that the Scripture preached before the Gospel unto Abraham,” and in another² place he says of the Jews under Moses, “that unto us was the Gospel preached *as well as unto them.*” The whole Bible is the history of the same one Church, in all its phases of growth and knowledge, and to search it for instruction how to set up a Church on Scriptural principles is absurd, because as there has ever been but one Church, so we must be as a community members of it, or else a self-constituted, unprivileged imitation of it. Scripture story does not profess to give any instructions regarding the mode of organizing *a* Church, but merely to bear witness to the unity and development of *the* Church.

¹ Gal. iii. 8. ² Heb. iv. 2.

Let us consider the argument which may be drawn from the *Name* of God's Society. We know that there was a deep religious meaning involved in the revelation (gradually made) of the *Name* of God himself, as EL, and ADONAI, and JEHOVAH. A striking significance may also be found in the *Name* of God's people, as a Society, in all ages. Its most ancient name in the Old Testament is קהל יהוה* (Kahal Jehovah). The Septuagintal equivalent for this name is ἐκκλησία κυρίου, (Ecclesia Kurion.) Now as the Jews of our Lord's day thought, and spoke, and read in Septuagintal phraseology, when engaged in religious subjects,—the fact that κύριος (Kurios), the familiar translation of Jehovah has been applied to Christ, has ever been considered a proof that Jehovah and Christ are identical in essence. Similarly, we argue that since ἐκκλησία (Ecclesia) is the familiar rendering in the Septuagint of קהל (Kahal) the

* קהל (kahal) and its equivalent ἐκκλησία was the name of the Jewish people regarded as a *religious* Community, a holy Nation, in contra-distinction to עדah (edah) the name of the people as a *civil* Community. The Septuagint translate the former by ἐκκλησία, ninety times, and the latter by συναγωγή, one hundred and thirty times. It is true that kahal also is translated by συναγωγή, thirty-seven times; but it is evident that these exceptions only prove the general rule that the Septuagint use Ecclesia whenever they wish to express the Jewish people when engaged in any religious act, or described in any connection with their duties to Jehovah. This will appear on examining the thirty-seven exceptions, and also from the striking fact that they never employ ἐκκλησία (Ecclesia) as a translation of עדah (edah). Bishop Wordsworth, in his note to St. Matthew xvi. 18, says that it is so employed; but we have not been able to find an instance even with the aid of the Concordance of Tromius. His reference to Psalm lxxxii. 1, as an instance, is surely a mistake, since the word there employed is συναγωγή.

assembly or congregation of God's people, and since Ecclesia is the term employed in the New Testament to designate the Christian body, the identity of the terms Kahal and Ecclesia prove the *intended* identity of God's Society under both Dispensations. This will appear more clearly if we remember that the word Ecclesia occurs but twice in the written life of Christ, and that on both occasions it was used by Himself. Moreover, it occurs in the Gospel of St. Matthew, the only one written in Hebrew. In both instances the word spoken by our Lord, and written by St. Matthew, was doubtless קהל (Kahal), and the translator of the Gospel into Greek, probably St. Matthew himself, rendered the word by ἐκκλησία (Ecclesia). It is also worth observing that on the first occasion of our Lord's using this word (St. Matthew, xvi. 18.) "I will build my Church,"—the Ecclesia evidently means the Christian Society, and that on the second occasion (St. Matthew xviii. 17,) it as clearly means the Jewish Society. "Tell it unto the Church." On the first occasion, our Lord was speaking of a Society, still in the future. On the second occasion he was giving a general rule to His hearers, and referring them to the existing Institution, the officers of the Jewish Church, appointed by the law of Moses, the Judges and Rulers of "*the* Ecclesia," not "of *my* Ecclesia," which was not as yet *built* upon the

foundation of Apostles and Prophets: Beza ^a remarks upon this place, "It is to be observed that in this one place of all the New Testament, the name of the Church is spoken of the Jews." This remark is not strictly accurate; because St. Stephen (Acts vii. 38,) speaks of the Jews as "the Ecclesia in the wilderness." Yet it is most significant that our Lord should have given to His Religious Society the same identical designation which was the common, familiar name of the existing Religious Society, intimating as clearly as words can do, that *His* Ecclesia, though about to differ from *the* Ecclesia, was to be a development or superstructure,—not something wholly new. If it be said that identity of name does not prove identity of Institution, because Ecclesia is used by the Septuagint to express an assembly of any kind, we may reply that the Septuagint apply the term *ἐκκλῆσια* to express both God and man; and yet its application to Christ has ever been deemed a satisfactory proof of His identity with Jehovah. Similarly Ecclesia, though it be used to express both a Divine and human organization among the Jews, yet its application by Christ, to express the Christian Society, proves the intended identity of the Jewish and Christian Churches.

The significance of bearing this in mind will be heightened if we remember that the whole scientific phraseology of the New Testament is taken from the

^a Vid. Bilson's Perpetual Gov. Ch. of Christ, p. 73.

Septuagint which was to all intents and purposes "the authorized version" among the Jews. Such words as Repentance, (μετάνοια) Faith (πίστις) Justification, (δικαιοσύνη) Redemption, (ἀπολύτρωσις) Atonement, (καταλλαγή) Propitiation (ἱλασμός) Church, (ἐκκλησία) and many such like are common to both, and when rightly understood, mean in each the same thing. Had Christianity been wholly independent of Judaism, in the sense popularly entertained, it would have needed a new terminology. But no such terminology was needed or invented. On the contrary, the science of salvation, through Christ, was preached and recorded in the old technical terms, which, for nearly three hundred years before the Incarnation, had been familiar to the Jews.

It is also worth observing that the common phraseology of the present day, *The Church of Christ*, nowhere occurs in the New Testament. Why, but to teach us that there was still in existence *The Church of God* of the Old Testament? It is true that we have *once* (Rom. xvi. 16.) "*The Churches of Christ* ; but the usual designation of the Christian community is the same as that of the Jewish, viz., (ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ) the Church of God ; and if the true reading, in Acts xx. 28, preferred by the best authorities, be (κυρίου) (Kurion) we have the identical designation applied by the Septuagint to the Jewish, used by St. Paul to express the Christian Church. If, indeed, the phrase

Church of *Christ* had been the usual New Testament expression, there might seem grounds for contrasting the Church of *God*, and the Church of *Christ*,* but no such contrast is to be found ; although from the almost universal use of the latter phrase in common conversation, and in our sermons, one would suppose that there was authority for it in the New Testament.

Again, not only is the name of the Society under both dispensations, the same, but the epithets used to express the privileges and prerogatives of the corporate members of the Society are identical also. St. Peter calls them “a chosen generation,” (γένος ἐκλεκτὸν) “a royal priesthood,” (βασιλείον ἱεράτευμα) “an holy nation,” (ἔθνος ἅγιον;) “a peculiar people,” (λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν;) the very terms applied to the Jews by Moses, (Deut. vii. 6; Exod. xix. 5,) and by Isaiah (chap. xliii. 21,) and taken *verbatim* from the Septuagint.

St. Paul also styles Christians “the Israel of God.” (Gal. vi. 16,) and, writing to the Gentile Christians of Ephesus, he reminds them that before their conversion they were “aliens from the commonwealth of Israel,” (Eph. ii. 12.) Can any phraseology indicate more clearly the belief of those two great Apostles regarding the con-

* If we may venture to assign a reason why we do not find the expression *Church of Christ* in the New Testament, we may find it in the fact that the Church is God's in a sense in which it is not Christ's. Christ is its Mediatorial King, but only till the consummation of all things, “when He shall have delivered up the Kingdom to God even the Father,” and “then shall the Son also Himself be subject unto Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all in all.”—I Cor. xv. 24-28.

tinuity and identity of privileges and blessings under both covenants?

Moreover, the names of the officers of the Christian Society were not new. The first were the twelve "whom also He named Apostles," (*ἀποστόλους*.) But as our Lord did not speak Greek, the word Apostles (*ἀποστόλους*) is doubtless a translation of the Syro-Chaldæic word used by Him שְׁלֻחִים (*Scheluchim*), persons sent or commissioned. It also means bridesmen; so that one reason, according to *Lamy*, why our Lord may have given this name to his first Ministers was because they were his bridesmen, in allusion to the Jewish custom of the bridegroom's friends leading the bride to his house, and this throws light upon that passage where we read that our Lord replied to the question, why his disciples did not fast, by saying, "Can the children of the bride-chamber fast while the Bridegroom is with them." We are also enabled to see more point in St. Paul's remarks on the great mystery of the marriage between Christ and His Church, and in his allusion to his own duty as an Apostle, when he says: "I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ." (II Cor. xi. 2.) This word *Apostle* (*ἀποστόλος*) was perfectly familiar to the Jews. It was the Septuagintal translation of (*Scheliachim*). And the same may be said of *Bishop* (*ἐπίσκοπος*.) The Septuagint, which was read in their synagogues every Sabbath day, must

have completely familiarized them with the term. They would hear and read (Numb. iv. 16.) that Eleazar, the son of Aaron the Priest, was called *Bishop* (ἐπίσκοπος) and that Jehoiada, (II Kings xi. 18.) “appointed officers (ἐπίσκοπους) over the house of the Lord.” Nehemiah, also, (chap. xi. 22) had said that there was an “*Overseer*, (ἐπίσκοπος) of the Levites at Jerusalem;” and Isaiah (chap. lx. 17,) in that magnificent outburst of Prophecy concerning the glory of the Church in the admission of the Gentiles, represents God as saying, “I will also make thy officers peace, and thine exactors (ἐπίσκοπους) righteousness.” The name of *Bishop* thus applied to Eleazar who had “the *oversight* (ἐπίσκοπην) of the tabernacle,” and to those whom Jehoiada the Priest had set over the house of the Lord;” used also by Nehemiah to denote “the *overseer* of the Levites,” and by Isaiah to describe the officers of the Church when the Messiah should come, such a word must, we repeat, have conveyed to the Jewish mind a well-known and familiar idea of Church government. Few things are more remarkable in the New Testament than the ready acquiescence with which the converts received the Church government established by the Apostles. Disputes and controversies arose about points of doctrine innumerable, but we read of none respecting government. St. Paul’s axiom was, that “the Priesthood being

changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law," (Heb. vii. 12,) and while the truth of the latter part of the axiom was by no means accepted unanimously, the acceptation of the former clause was universal. The fact is, that the Messiahship of Jesus being once admitted, the transfer of the Priesthood from the Levitical Priests to those appointed by Him was acknowledged as a necessary consequence. No attempt was made to oppose the Apostles and Presbyters on the ground that "they sought the Priesthood also;" although it is very evident from St. Jude's words (Jude xi.) that the sin of Korah may be committed by Christians. Neither did any schism or controversy ever arise regarding the abolition of the chief function of the Levitical Priests, the bloody sacrifices of the altar. So ingrained in Jews and Gentiles was the idea of sacrifice that nothing more marvellous appears in the history of Christianity than the unanimity with which it was abandoned; and one reason for it may be that the Eucharistic Sacrifice of the Lord's Supper fully answered the cravings of the soul; but the truth is the Septuagint Scriptures had prepared the minds of Jews and Gentiles for the transfer of the Priesthood to Christ, and those commissioned by Him, and for the abolition of bloody sacrifices also.* The.

* In the Greek version the literal import of the legal or sacrificial ceremonial terms is seldom exactly translated. A more general and less definite word is often substituted. The Septuagint was destined to change the Hebrew, into the Hellenist by gradually enlarging his conceptions.—Grinfield's Apology for the LXX., p 124.

Epistle to the Hebrews was written with the same view, and is, in consequence, more full of Septuagintal quotations than any other part of the New Testament. From the Greek version of the Old Testament, the believers in Christ derived, as from a vocabulary, the names of their Church officers as well as their doctrinal phraseology, so that both had much less appearance of novelty than we are disposed to think. Without the providential existence of that version, the propagation of Christ's kingdom would, humanly speaking, have been infinitely more difficult, but it served as an aqueduct to conduct the river of God from the dark fountains of the original Hebrew, till it flowed brightly and clearly into the reservoir of the New Testament.

DISCOURSE II.

“for whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning.”—ROM. xv. 4.

IN the previous discourse I endeavoured to show that we ought not to expect to find in the New Testament the plans and specifications of the Christian Church, because, in reality, it was not so much a new one that was established as an old one that was modified. Had minute directions for the formation of the Church been laid down, like those for the building of the Ark or the Tabernacle, the mistake might have been made and perpetuated, of supposing Christianity something totally new and revolutionary, and not, as it really is, the culmination and fulfilment of the law and the Prophets. Hence the great necessity of lending an attentive ear and a prayerful heart to the Old Testament Scriptures, which were written for the very purpose that we might understand the New. If all the quotations from the Old Testament, made by our Lord and His Apostles and Evangelists, were gathered together, they would occupy a space equal to that of St. Mark's Gospel. The two Testaments are thus interwoven together, and so are the Jewish and Christian Churches.

In proof, I cited some passages from St. Paul's writings which prove that, in his judgment, Christians were the true "Israel of God." The Apostle's oral and written teaching were thus understood by his fellow-labourer, St. Clement, who wrote his first Epistle to the Church at Corinth before the books of the New Testament were gathered into a volume, and, in all probability, before some of them were written. The continuity of the two dispensations is his leading idea.* He corrects abuses at Corinth by an appeal to the injunctions of our Lord, and reminds the Corinthians that High Priest, Priests, Levites and laymen have their respective ministries. This merging of the Jewish Ecclesiastical Polity in the Christian everywhere appears in the writings of those who lived nearest the times, and best understood the teaching, of the Apostles. Hence, we should not be surprised at what Eusebius tells us on the authority of the historian Polycrates, who lived A.D. 190, that St. John used to wear the *Petalon* (πέταλον) or Jewish mitre.

Epiphanius also says, on the authority of Clemens, Alex., and others, that St. James the Less wore the same

* "And thus preaching through the countries and cities, they (the Apostles), appointed the first fruits (of their labours) having first proved them by the Spirit, to be Bishops and Deacons, of those who should afterwards believe. Nor was this anything new ; since, indeed, many ages before it was written concerning Bishops and Deacons. For thus saith the Scripture, (Isaiah lxx. 17.) I will appoint their Bishops in righteousness, and their Deacons in faith."—St. Clement to the Corinthians.

sacerdotal plate; and we cannot read the opening words of his Catholic Epistle without suspecting strongly that he, as Bishop of Jerusalem, considered that he had succeeded to the true and spiritual High Priesthood, and that he had therefore authority to address "The Twelve Tribes." He was filling the office in the kingdom of which Christ spoke, when He promised that His Apostles "should sit on Thrones judging the Twelve Tribes of Israel." Indeed the Jewish element *must* have prevailed extensively at Jerusalem; the Scriptural statement that a great company (*ὄχλος*) of the Priests were obedient to the faith. (Acts vi. 7.) and that many myriads (*μυριάδες*) of Jews believed, (Acts xxi. 20,) prepare us for the historical fact that the first fifteen Bishops of the City, that is, to the time of the Emperor Hadrian, were Hebrews of the Circumcision. St. Basil, in the fourth century, gives similar testimony, when he says: "A portion of believers in Christ has been saved from the whole of Israel, the election having been found in a few only; which portion acting as leaven to the Gentiles has drawn them all over to a resemblance of itself." It has been well said by a late writer,* "The Constitution which Christ gave to mankind has been found capable of being transplanted into almost every soil; but, notwithstanding, it is native to Palestine, and must have been

* Author of "Ecce Homo."

embraced by those to whom it was first given, with an ease and readiness which the western nations cannot emulate. Christ's Constitution was not a new invention, but a crowning development of that which had existed in Palestine since the race of Israel had lived there." Hence we trace the influence of Judaism in almost all the Institutions of the Church, and this is not the result of accident, but of necessary consequence. The family likeness of the parent stock is still visible in the children. Bishops, priests, and deacons were not only suggested by, but are the Christian representatives of, High Priest, Priests and Levites. Our Churches are planned after the model of the Tabernacle and the Synagogue arrangements, chancel and nave corresponding with the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies. The Table of the Lord placed in the chancel, and at the east end, and bearing witness to the Blood of the New Covenant, perpetuates the custom of setting the ark containing the book of the Law, at the Jerusalem-end or sanctuary of the Synagogue. The surplice is the substitute for the Jewish ephod. The elements of the Holy Eucharist are to be found in the Passover service; for not only was there a lamb roasted whole with two spits thrust through it, the one lengthwise, crossing the longitudinal one, so that the animal was in a manner crucified, and typified "Christ our Passover"

* The history of the institution of the Passover, and the cxiv--cxviii Psalms are proper Lessons and Psalms, respectively, for the Christian Passover Feast

sacrificed for us," but the master of the family broke bread after having blessed it, and divided to each one a part, and likewise wine mixed with water, called the *cup of benediction*, referred to by St. Paul, (I Cor. x. 16.) who calls the Sacramental wine "the cup of blessing," after which the cxv-cxviii Psalms were sung. The admission of infants to Church-membership, by baptism, has no direct authority for it in the New Testament; but the analogy of circumcision, and the fact that the law of membership was not repealed, justify infant baptism. The rules which direct the naming of children at their baptism, and which forbid the admission of the unbaptised to the Holy Communion, are derived from the Jewish practices of naming* children (as in the case of our Lord and St. John the Baptist) at their circumcision, and of prohibiting the uncircumcised from the Passover feast. The system of sponsors comes from the Jews, who received proselytes by circumcision and *baptism*, when three witnesses or sponsors were present at the ceremony; and the well-known phrase *Regeneration* in baptism is the Christian form of the Jewish saying, that proselytes immersed in baptism rose new men, or the *new-born* sons of

of Easter. The Psalms selected by the Church are the hymns sung at the Passover by the Jews, and no doubt were the Hymns sung by our Lord and His Apostles at the Last Supper.

* Paradoxical though it be, our commonest *Christian* names are *Jewish*, and the popular epithets of endearment used to express our Churches are *Zion* and *Jerusalem*.

Abraham ; and so transforming was this baptism supposed to be, that it put an entire end to the proselyte's connection with his kindred according to the flesh. Hence our Lord's surprise that Nicodemus, a master in Israel, did not understand his reference to a new birth by water. The right of Confirmation is evidently an adaptation to the circumstances of the Christian Church, of that ceremony by which every young Jew, at the age of twelve years, came to the Temple for examination in the Law. The laying on of the Bishop's hand corresponds with the blessing given by the Jewish Priest, and the release of God-parents from obligations is the co-relative of the law by which the young Jew, after such examination and blessing, was held personally liable for infraction of the law of Moses. An instance of such a rite is mentioned by St. Luke, when he informs us that our Lord, at the age of twelve years, went to the Temple and was found sitting in the midst of the Doctors. The Churching of women is simply a Christian imitation of the Jewish ceremony of Purification. But it is not only in such ecclesiastical arrangements that the analogy between the Church before the day of Pentecost and afterwards may be seen ; each baptised Christian is the true representative of the faithful sons of Abraham. We confess it when in our solemn Good Friday Service we pray : " That all Jews, Turks, Infidels and Heretics may be saved among the remnant of *the true Israelites.*" Nay, more,

in our daily service we deliberately employ as our own Anthems of praise, the songs of the Blessed Virgin and Zacharias, and call Abraham "*our forefather.*" . Our Liturgical solemnities are largely composed of Jewish Psalms and Hymns, which we Christianize by appending to them a "*Gloria Patri.*" The Lord's Prayer itself is not an original composition. It consists of selections made from the Prayers of the Synagogue ; our Lord thus intimating, significantly, that the Church he was building was not a new one, but a development of the old, and its prayers intended to be eclectic (as they are) from those of the Jews. Even in the highest of all our acts of worship, the Holy Communion, we begin our service with the recitation of the Jewish Decalogue, and "this Ministration of wrath written and engraven on stones," connects us with our Jewish original when "showing forth our Lord's death." The custom of reading in the daily service a lesson from the Old and New Testament, not only intimates our equal respect for both, but is derived from the usage of reading in the Synagogues a lesson from the Law and the Prophets. The combination of sermons with divine worship had its origin in the practice of the Synagogue after the Babylonish captivity, when discourses on the Law became necessary to prevent the people from relapsing into idolatry. The Antiphonal chanting of the Psalter is a Jewish practice, the only Christian peculiarity being

the addition of a doxology to each Psalm. The Cathedral usage of saying the service chorally comes to us from the Jews, who always read their prayers, and even the Scriptures, in a chant; and so late as the prayer-book of Elizabeth, the Rubric directed "the Lessons to be sung in a plain tune after the manner of distinct reading, and likewise the Epistle and Gospel." The building of our Churches east and west, so that the worshippers should pray eastward, is derived from the practice of the Jews to pray towards Jerusalem. Thus David says: "I will worship *towards* Thy holy temple," (Ps. v. 7,) and Daniel kneeled upon his knees and prayed, "his windows being open *toward* Jerusalem," (Dan. vi. 10.) "Executing the Priest's office in the order of his course," like Zacharias, is represented at this day in the alternating services of Canons residentiary. The distinction which we draw between the Civil and Ecclesiastical year originated with the Jews, and religious communities under vows are clearly traceable to the schools of the Prophets and the Essene Sect. The greater and lesser Excommunication were a reproduction of the very same discipline among the Jews, and are the equivalents of the Greek Anathema, and the Syriac Maranatha uttered by St. Paul. The Jewish "Sabbath of their Lord their God," is perpetuated, if not in the letter, yet in spirit and in truth in the Lord's day. The mode of maintaining the Jewish priesthood by tithes and offerings passed on by

Divine command to the Christian, for as "they who minister about holy things live by the things of the temple, and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar, *even so* (οὕτω καί) hath the Lord ordained that they who preach the Gospel should live by the Gospel." (I Cor. ix.) The placing the Bible in the hands of every bishop, at his consecration, is the continuation of the custom which, as Josephus tells us, ever prevailed, of delivering the Old Testament Scripture to the charge of the High Priest on his succession to the office. We have the testimony of the Apostolic Constitutions that this rite existed in the Church in the second century, the Church thus, by action and symbol, expressing the belief that to her, as to the Jews previously, had been "committed the oracles of God," and that as "a witness and keeper of Holy writ," she possesses a Ministry with a Jewish as well as an Apostolic succession. Some of the same errors, too, which prevailed among the Jews, have descended to us ; perhaps the worst of them is the tendency to sectarianism. Pharisees, Saducees and Herodians have their representatives in the Church to-day, in Calvinists, Armenians and Erastians. Those church-members who hold the doctrine of particular election, are the counterpart of those Jews who claimed to be, as individuals, what they were only as a people, holy and elect, and were continually crying out, "The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, are we." The literal Sabbatarian-

ism of the Jews has descended to the same class of religionists, in spite of all our Lord's assertions, and the legislation of his Apostles. Many in the present day make the New Testament void by their tradition, just as the Jews treated the Old Testament, and rendered it of "no effect." The pride and exclusiveness of those who loved the "chief and uppermost seats in the Synagogues," that is the seats nearest the place where the sacred books were kept, have been inherited by us, to the great damage of the Church. But enough has been said to show how reasonable, as well as how significant it is, to find the Jewish element so strong in the Church. From the days of St. Paul to the present hour there never has been a restriction laid on the adoption of a Jewish usage, simply because it *was* Jewish, *unless it involved false doctrine*. Such a restriction could not have been entertained by St. Paul, who accommodated himself to Jewish usages, by directing that St. Timothy should be circumcised, by "shaving his own head at Cenchræa, because he had a vow," and by "purifying himself, and being at charges with four men who had a vow." His language, "I must by all means keep this feast (Pentecost) which cometh at Jerusalem, and St. Luke's statement that, "he hasted, if it were possible for him, to be at Jerusalem at the day of Pentecost," are not consistent with a total renunciation of Jewish observances, which he tolerated, but did not enforce. No Jewish peculiarity was, in all probability,

abandoned, unless the use of it indicated, directly or indirectly, that the Christ had not come in the flesh. Hence, the Passover, with its prophetic types—the crucified lamb without a bone broken—could not be retained, when once the anti-type had appeared, and hence, too, the abolition of all sacrifice for sin.

From the considerations mentioned we infer, that in order to arrive at a clear view of the structure of the Apostolic Church, we must do as the Apostles did in their addresses, *recapitulate*, and examine the doctrines and discipline which preceded it, and which were gradually merged in it. We shall then see how naturally, in everything “pertaining to the Kingdom of God,” there is a correspondence with the details of the Jewish Theocracy. Doubtless, Christ intended this correspondence. He chose *twelve* Apostles to sit on thrones judging the *twelve* tribes of Israel, and “appointed other *seventy* also,” a sort of Christian Sanhedrim, and we are plainly led to believe that in the interval of forty days between his resurrection and ascension, He gave specific instructions regarding the positive institutions of the Church. For in the account of the Acts of the Apostles, they never seem to have been at a loss what to do, but always to have had their programme ready. They proceed to elect a successor to Judas, and on hearing of the conversion of the Samaritans, to commission two of their own number to confirm them, *as matters of course*. They knew exactly what steps to take under the cir-

cumstances, and this must be attributed to their having received explicit instructions from Christ himself. We know that He charged them to "teach men to observe all things whatsoever He had commanded them," and those things were so numerous that the Mission of the Comforter was needed to bring them to their remembrance. If we bear these things in mind, remembering that according to our Lord's own declaration, "Salvation is of the Jews," (John iv. 22,) and that the Society which was organized to herald this salvation, was, at the first, of the Jews also, we shall find much assistance in answering the objection, that the Scriptures contain no code of by-laws or canonical regulations, for the government of the Society. It was the doctrines not the organization of the Society that had the appearance of novelty, its constitution being formed according to the oral teaching of its founder, by the adaptation of existing materials. Now, wherein consists the practical importance of taking these things into consideration? It lies in the fact that in these days of divisions and schisms, people, when distracted by the conflicting claims of Episcopacy, Congregationalism, Presbyterianism, or Methodism, &c., search the New Testament, hoping to find such plans and specifications of the Church of God as will enable them to detect the original building and decide the issue. But being disappointed in their search, they fly to the conclusion that all Christian Societies are equally good and Scrip-

tural, provided their creed (as they term it,) be orthodox. They quite forget that no part of the New Testament pretends to give any such descriptions as they are looking for. It is a self-evident truth, though we need to be reminded of it, that the Church must be older than any written account of it. Richard Baxter says the "*Creed* is the very sum and kernel of the doctrine of the New Testament, and it is *older* than the *writings* of the New Testament." But one of the articles of the Apostles' Creed is, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," and of it we may say as Baxter has said of the other articles, the "Apostles were not such formalists, or friends to ignorance and hypocrisy as to encourage the baptized to take up with the saying, 'I believe in the Holy Catholic Church,' without teaching them to understand what they said." It would be therefore most unreasonable to expect to find Canons descriptive of Church government in the New Testament, because the writers were addressing persons to whom these things were perfectly familiar, and which had been made known to them previous to their Baptism.

The organization for the details of which we are supposed to be seeking, is much older than the writings in which we are seeking for them. The Apostolic Church was not moulded into shape according to any Scriptural definitions, but, on the contrary, the Scripture itself needed the evidence and approval of the

Church before it could have had any authority as declaratory of the will of God. Our twentieth article says, that "the Church is the witness and keeper of Holy Writ," but we try to reverse the order of things, and make Holy Writ the witness and keeper of the Church. The New Testament was not written with the object of putting on record for all ages the draft of a Church Society. We cannot, of course, expect to find such in the Gospels, which contain narratives of events which occurred before the Church was organized at all; nor yet in the Epistles, which were written to fully organized Churches, not to inform them how they or their successors were to constitute themselves into societies, but to correct abuses, and to exhort to the maintenance of the faith, and to godly living. We might naturally expect to find in the Acts of the Apostles (if anywhere) a complete pattern of Church organization; but even there we find the items scattered here and there, incidentally, and evidently subsidiary to other objects. The fact is, the writers, and they to whom they were writing, were already members of a divinely constituted organization, when they wrote, and do not seem to be in the least conscious that they were writing history to which after ages would appeal for a warrant to justify Church polity. All, therefore, that we find, or ought to expect to find, is *allusion* to a state of things existing in their day, sometimes vague, sometimes plain enough, and all valuable when rightly considered.

It would tend to a right knowledge of the mutual relations of the Scriptures and the Church, if we would remember what so many forget, that the writing of the New Testament was not the *cause* of the spread of Christianity, or of the organization of the Church, but was the *effect* of both. Notwithstanding the researches and erudition of the greatest scholars, we are in ignorance as to when, or by whom, the Canon of the New Testament was compiled. We know that the books of which it is composed are genuine and authentic, but we also know that our present Canon did not obtain a fixed character, was not stereotyped, (so to speak) till nearly 400 years after Christ. Nothing can more plainly show the futility and unreasonableness of supposing that it was written to supply us with a receipt-book, by the directions of which men could set up a Scriptural Church or Churches. Indeed on the supposition that the sacred books were composed for this purpose, we must see that they have utterly failed of their object. *Before* the age of printing they could not have been read with such intent, as till then they were practically unknown to the great mass of the laity; and *since* the era of printing, the reading of them to find out rules of guidance in forming churches has resulted in a multitude of contradictory sects, all, however, claiming to be Scriptural Churches.

Can we, then, derive no information from the New Testament regarding the Structure of the Church,

sufficient, at least, to enable us to identify her? We certainly can, if we search for it aright, as we should for historical facts. We must seek for it precisely in the same manner that we seek for the Creeds. How are the great doctrines of the Gospel revealed to us in the New Testament? Not in Canons, Creeds, Articles or By-laws, but incidentally and obliquely. The most mysterious doctrines and peculiarities of the Christian religion are not given in the Scriptures in such a way as to force conviction, or appear convincingly plain to a common understanding. On the contrary, they are arrived at inferentially by deductions of reasoning, and it is not too much to say, that not one reader in a myriad would be able, unassisted, to draw from the New Testament the dogmas and subtleties and definitions of the three Creeds. Doctrines are taught us in the New Testament by allusion and incidentally, and as Archbishop Whately says, the "more forcibly, for that very reason, because the writers alluded to truths not only essential, but indisputably admitted and known to be essential by those to whom they were writing." To ascertain, therefore, the system of Theology propounded, demands diligent investigation, helps and knowledge, and the very difficulties in the way test our honesty of purpose, and afford scope for a virtuous or a vicious exercise of our intellect. Now there is a strong analogy between the manner in which doctrines are announced, and the manner in which rules for the

organization of the Church, which was to guard and perpetuate those doctrines, are intimated to mankind. In both cases the sacred writings are a touch-stone which we may fairly apply to anything which claims to be Catholic and Apostolical, but we shall be greatly disappointed if we expect to be able to get through the process successfully, without the deepest humility, and prayerful assiduity.

This view does not captivate most minds, even among earnest people. They say, it is true, that we read of Bishops, Priests and Deacons ; of certain men ordaining elders, and confirming the baptized ; of such godly discipline as fasting, and a weekly offertory, but these things are mentioned *only incidentally*. "Surely," says Whately, "on any point in which it was designed that all Christians should be everywhere, and at all times, bound as strictly as the Jews were to the Levitical law ; we may fairly conclude they would have received directions no less precise and minute than had been afforded to the Jews." And so they did, but it was from the lips, and not from the writings, of the Apostles. This *a priori* expectation that the structure of the Church should have been laid down as precisely as that of the Tabernacle, if Christians were to be bound by it as strictly as the Jews were to the Levitical law, is most unreasonable. For even supposing that the allusions and incidental remarks concerning the Church, in the New Testament, differ very

much in apparent force from the positive precepts of Leviticus, concerning the Jewish ritual, yet it does by no means follow that both are not equally binding revelations. "For," says a greater reasoner than Whately, Bishop Butler, "we cannot argue that this cannot be the sense or intent of such a passage of Scripture, for if it had, it would have been expressed more plainly. Yet we may justly argue thus with respect to common books, and the reason of this difference is very evident, that in Scripture we are not competent judges, as we are in common books, how plainly it were to have been expected what is the true sense should have been expressed, or under how apt an image figured. The only question is, what appearance there is that this is the sense, and scarce at all, how much more determinately or accurately it might have been expressed." There is, indeed, a wide difference between the manner in which the Jews were taught their Church Polity by Moses, and the manner in which Christians are taught theirs by St. Paul. Moses wrote avowedly to teach the Jews their Polity, St. Paul did not. He, and the other New Testament writers wrote for fully organized Churches, and while instructing them in matters of doctrine and the religious life, always assume that they to whom they were writing knew the first principles of Church government. But still we can glean much information from the indirect allusions, the examples, the "Acts of the Apostles," even when

the expressions seem merely *obiter dicta*. Nay, more, there are many *hints* in the New Testament which should not be disregarded; they are valuable or they would not have been recorded. Christ and St. Paul founded many an argument upon hints. He taught the doctrine of the Resurrection by an inference drawn from the tense of a verb, "I *am* the God of Abraham," &c. He refuted the popular notion regarding the Messiah, by an argument which depends on the fact that David calls his son his Lord. His inference from David's eating the shew-bread would scarcely be obvious to many. St. Paul builds an argument on the fact that the word "*seed*," (Gal. iii. 16,) is used by Jehovah in the singular, not in the plural number. His deduction from the Mosaic injunction, "Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn," (I Cor. ix. 9,) would not have occurred to us. He infers the decaying character of the old Covenant from the use of the word "*new*," by Jeremiah, and in quoting the Prophet Haggai, he reasons from the force of the adverb "*once*." It would be endless to cite all the passages in which St. Paul argues from the meaning or emphasis of single words, and the Holy Spirit intends that we should treat the New Testament as St. Paul treated the Old. We have precedents for drawing inferences from modes of expression, even where doctrines are involved, and much more are we justified in inferring the Apostolic system of Church government

from the hints and indirect allusions, and forms of expressions scattered throughout the Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles. To quote Bishop Butler again, "The hindrances, too, of natural and supernatural light and knowledge have been of the same kind; and as it is owned that the whole scheme of Scripture is not yet understood, so if it ever comes to be understood, it must be in the same way as natural knowledge is come at, by the continuance and progress of learning and liberty, and by particular persons attending to, comparing and pursuing intimations scattered up and down it, which are overlooked and disregarded by the generality of the world. For this is the way in which all improvements are made, by thoughtful men tracing on obscure hints, as it were, dropped us by nature, accidentally, or which seem to come into our minds by chance." As an illustration of our subject, let us suppose an enquirer into the Apostolical form of the Church's Ministry, unconvinced by the historical argument which shows that for 1,500 years after Christ, no form was known but the Episcopal; nor yet by the weighty arguments from the Epistles to Timothy and Titus. To such an one we would suggest that something may be learned from the word so often used by Christ and His Apostles to designate the Church: the words "*Kingdom of Heaven*." His forerunner preached that the *Kingdom of Heaven* was at hand. Christ himself preached the Gospel of the *Kingdom*.

Only twice did He use the term Church ; and in His parables, when foreshowing the future destiny of that Church, he ever used the words *Kingdom of Heaven*. These words could not possibly have meant his invisible Church, because good and bad were to be gathered into its net ; and because it was to have keys by which it was to be shut and opened. Now is there not in the designed selection of the term *Kingdom*, an intimation that there should not be a *parity* of Ministers in its administration ? Is not the Monarchical idea manifest ? and if the *Kingdom of Heaven* bears any analogy to the *Kingdom in Heaven*, may we not expect that grades of rank should prevail, for there is assuredly revealed to us the existence of a celestial Hierarchy ? This is, however, only reasoning from intimations and hints, and yet he who carefully examines all the passages in which the word occurs, will not fail to see considerable force in the use and meaning of it.

What encouragement have we in these considerations to the careful study of the Scriptures ? How is faith strengthened by that humble and earnest perusal of the Divine records which results in the discovery of new beauty, new power, new coincidences ! And be it remembered by those who presumptuously suppose that God *ought* to have given us our instructions in plainer terms than He has been pleased to do, on those subjects like Church government, which have rent and torn Christendom, that obedience is not rendered to moral

precepts in the proportion of their dogmatic plainness. Then why should we suppose that minute directions regarding government or ritual would fare better if we had them. Nothing can be well more precise than the Decalogue, and yet we know how the Jews made it void by their tradition, of which their treatment of the fifth commandment was a notable instance. And among ourselves, what duties are more disregarded than those which are most plainly enjoined, such as partaking of the Holy Communion and the duty of fasting? In ritual and Church order, what can be more specific than the condemnation of favoritism, and respect of persons in the Church, and yet the pew system is in full force without the smallest pang being caused by its abuses. It is not then the plain precepts of Scripture whether as to doctrine or ritual, or discipline, that alone demand respectful investigation. The will of God, however conveyed, is still the will of God. "*All* Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable." God's will has been revealed to us "at sundry times, and in divers manners," perhaps to suit all classes of men, and all habits of mind. A man may have been brought to believe that Jesus was Christ, by pondering on the marvellous way in which thousands of types find their solution in Him, and yet the same person would be quite unimpressed by the history of His miracles. The wondrous way in which the sayings and doings of Moses and the Prophets, fit into, and explain the life

and death of Christ, has proved too strong an argument for many a sceptic ; because, as has been well said, "The more numerous and intricate the wards of a lock, the more certain may we be that the key which fits it is the very key of that lock." Be exhorted, then, brethren, to a reverent study of those things which Moses in the law, and the Prophets did write." They will lead you to Jesus, and make you to understand, so far as human intelligence can, His first advent. Be assured that Moses and the Prophets reveal to us mystically the miracle of mercy contained in the atonement, as certainly as Moses and Elias on the Mount of transfiguration spoke of His decease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem ; they will make you as they made St. Timothy, "*wise* unto salvation," and enable you to understand those pregnant sayings of our Lord, "if they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." "If ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?"

DISCOURSE III.

“ For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning.” ROM. xv. 4.

IN former sermons, I directed attention to some mistaken views with which many persons read the Scriptures of the New Testament, when they search them for the purpose of identifying the Apostolic form of Church Government. In order to correct these views, and to enable enquirers fairly and successfully to perform their task, two points are to be remembered. First, that the Christian Church is not so much a new organization, as an enlargement and remodelling of an old one; that the Church of the old Dispensation bears to the Church of the new, a relation very similar to that which the Old Testament bears to the New Testament; the New being *enveloped* in the Old, and the Old being *developed* by the New. The second point to be kept in view is, that the New Testament was not written with the intention of conveying either at the time its authors wrote, or since, any such information as we express by the words Canons, Constitution and By-laws of Church Government. Having been written long after the Church was established in a great part of the world, and addressed to members of

a fully organized community, it is unreasonable to expect to find anything more than allusions and indirect hints as to the structure of the visible Church. We are not, however, to conclude that God did not intend to convey his will to us by these allusions and hints, however apparently incidental. On the contrary, we are taught by the analogy of nature, that knowledge in natural science is gathered by thoughtful and observant men watching for and profiting by hints and suggestions ; and there seems no reason why in supernatural science God should not teach us in the same way. Moreover, we know that the moral precepts of the Bible are not obeyed in the direct proportion of their unmistakeable plainness, nor, indeed, the positive precepts either, and therefore we infer that we are not judges beforehand of the method best suited to convey to perverse human nature, a revelation concerning Church polity. Now there are two ways in which God might have imparted to us this revelation. First, in the precise and dogmatic way, such as the Decalogue and Levitical law in the Old Testament, and the institution of Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord, in the New ; secondly, in the indirect and inferential way, such as the institution of ordination, confirmation, the weekly offertory, infant baptism, and the admission of women to Holy Communion. If we wish to know which of these two modes is the most successful in winning obedience, and if we allow expe-

rience to decide the point, we shall have little difficulty in declaring in favour of the indirect and inferential method. There would seem to be something in human nature which attaches it more warmly to a doctrine or a polity which it has reasoned out for itself, by an analysis of Scripture, than to the most detailed and minute commands, even though perfectly plain, and prefaced with the solemn formula, "Thus saith the Lord." We cannot then but think that the statement is most illogical which asserts "that on any point in which it was designed that all Christians should be at all times, and everywhere bound as strictly as the Jews were to the Levitical Law, we may plainly conclude they would have received directions no less minute than had been afforded to the Jews."* For why should we draw any such inference? The great point after all, is not the form or shape of the directions, but the giving them in the way best calculated to secure an obedience as universal as possible. The sharp and precise character of the Levitical code did not secure general obedience at all times. The commands to observe the Sacraments of Circumcision and the Passover were frequently violated. The denunciations against idolatry were constantly disregarded. And in the New Testament we can find illustrations which prove that plain, direct precepts do not command our obedience a whit more, nor even as much as oblique and indirect

* Whately's Kingdom of Christ, page 75.

ones. Indeed some of the plainest and most direct precepts are utterly neglected; the precept against eating blood, and suing brethren in civil courts are not considered binding. The directions for the observance of love-feasts, anointing the sick in order to their cure, the kiss of peace, and washing each others feet, are equally explicit and obsolete. Now, in contrast, consider the admittedly binding force of indirect precepts. The substitution of the Lord's Day for the Sabbath, and its observance in a different manner from that of the Jewish seventh day of the week, are taught us very incidentally, and only by way of inference; yet they are felt to be of universal obligation. Infant baptism, again, has only an indirect authority in the New Testament, and is only arrived at by arguments derived from the Old Testament, applied by parity of reasoning to the New. Yet for all that, it is the well-nigh universally observed law of Christendom. On the other hand, contrast with the obedience rendered to these indirect revelations of God's will, the reception given by the Christian world to the direct, plain and incontestible commands to maintain the visible unity of the Church. We say *visible* unity, because though well aware of the tradition which makes the word of God void, and says that it is *invisible* unity of spirit that is intended, yet we cannot honestly read the New Testament without feeling that in Apostolic times, Excommunication was a fearful reality. It never once occurred

to St. Paul that an excommunicated member of the Corinthian Church could be admitted to communion at Ephesus, Crete or Rome. In the present day this proof of unity is wanting, because excommunication from the Anglican Church is no bar to reception into communion with the Roman Church, or *vice versâ*. A Methodist read out of meeting, finds no difficulty in getting the right hand of fellowship in a dozen different denominations. For this reason we think that the plain, positive and explicit injunctions to unity, refer, not as some think, to an invisible and spiritual, but to a visible and practical unity, and we need not occupy time in showing how Christians have set at naught St. Paul's commands, and have striven to frustrate their Lord's prayer for the unity of His people. Direct precepts, then, have never been obeyed more fully than indirect ones, and if so, why should we conclude that God should or would always have employed the former? To reason concerning items of Church government, that they were either not considered binding when the New Testament was written, or deemed of little importance by the writers, *because* they are not as explicit as we wish, is absurd. Such an inference could be reasonable, only on the supposition that the books were written expressly for the purpose of giving us the information desired, and this we know not to be the case. An illustration or two on this point may not be unnecessary. Suppose that Geologists

appealed on behalf of rival systems, to the Mosaical account of the creation, and that we thus became involved in seeming contradictions, the ready answer is that Genesis is not self-contradictory, nor conveniently elastic, because the intention of the writer was not to teach us geology. Or if a Philologist were to appeal to the account of the confusion of tongues, or to the fact that Adam gave names to every living creature, in proof or disproof of the divine origin of language, we should at once extricate ourselves from apparent perplexity by saying that the object of Moses was not to teach philology. We should see clearly enough that these sciences must be wrought out independently, while we should be inclined to believe that theories about them are most likely to be truly scientific which best fit into, explain and harmonize the incidental statements of Scripture. Again, we may learn by careful enquiry, a good deal concerning the Government of the Roman Empire, in the days of Christ and his Apostles, out of the New Testament, but inasmuch as the writers had not the remotest intention of teaching their contemporaries or us, whether that government was Imperial, or Senatorial, or Republican, it would be preposterous for us to decide the point *on the authority of Inspiration*. Some mode of Government must indeed have existed, and all that we can know on the subject is, that the one most likely to be true, is that into which the incidental

allusions of Scripture best fit, and with which the facts stated harmonize. Or, let us take an illustration from the Liturgy of the Church. It was written to direct our worship and ritual, not to teach us Church government; yet we may learn much from it on this subject too. A thousand years hence, however, if we suppose the ordination services to be lost, it will not supply incontestible evidence of what we know to be the fact, that the Anglican Church was committed to a belief in a three-fold Ministry. We can suppose objectors hereafter saying that the liturgy alludes to "Bishops and Curates" only, and that although in one place it speaks of "Bishops, Priests and Deacons," yet that the Prayer is on behalf of the Deacons and Priests of other Christian Churches. Great stress would be laid on the *omissions* in the Liturgy, that the Church Catechism takes no notice of Church government, except so far as to *allude* to "spiritual Pastors and Masters," and that the subject was of no importance, or else the elements of it would have been taught to catechumens. It would be forcibly urged, that the Thirty-nine Articles make allusion to it, *but nothing more*. Now in point of fact, we know how erroneous such reasoning as the foregoing would be, if used to prove that the government of the Church of England was not definitely Episcopal, with a three-fold Ministry, and similarly, we should argue, that it by no means follows that the government of the Church was

not determined and fixed when the Apostles wrote, though we see in their writings only hints and allusions, incidentally made, to familiarly known facts; and as to reasoning positively from total omissions, we may use the words of Dean Stanley, "No arguments can be drawn against a fact from the mere silence of authors, whether sacred or secular, whose minds were fixed on other subjects, and who were writing with other intentions.*

It seems very strange that, although *a priori* reasoning in the realm of nature is exploded, it should still hold its ground in the realm of Revelation. And yet nothing is more certain than that we shall err most grievously if we set out with the assumption that such and such a point *ought* to have been revealed, and plainly too. That was the very error of the Ebionite Christians of the first century. They professed faith in Christ, but adhered to a strict compliance with the Levitical Law. Why? Because the writings of the New Testament were not explicit enough for them. If God, said they, who revealed Himself as an unchanging God, had intended the Mosaic Law to be only temporary, and prefatory to another system, He would have declared His intention as explicitly, and with sanctions as awful as He had originally promulged His Law from Mount Sinai. The argument, that if the system of Church government, referred to in the

* Stanley's "Jewish Church," p. 556.

New Testament, were intended to be of universal obligation, it would have been as explicitly laid down as the Levitical code, proceeds on an assumption precisely similar to that of the Ebionites. Both assume that if such and such were God's intention, *they* are the best judges of the method He ought to have employed to impress it upon mankind. But the only admissible, because the only philosophical, mode of reasoning is, to examine the phenomena presented to us in the New Testament, and then to ascertain in any given Church Polity whether these phenomena appear and the conditions be fulfilled. In order, however, to feel sure that we have understood the phenomena rightly, we must see that they harmonize not only Scriptural allusions, but historical facts. If a student thinks that all the references, allusions, hints and facts of the New Testament concerning Church Government, point plainly to Congregationalism or Presbyterianism, he cannot be satisfied of the correctness of his theory, till he has explained by it, how within a few years after the death of the Apostles, Episcopacy was universal, and continued to be so for 1500 years. The student, if he be honest and capable, will at once see that the New Testament was not given to *teach* Church government, but to *prove* it, and he will also see, that like nature, the New Testament, at first sight, appears to be all confusion and unsystematic. He will proceed to gather up the fragments of information on the

matter under investigation, to analyze the contents till he finds a system that will explain and harmonize the facts. A Naturalist can infer from an examination of a few fossilized bones of an extinct animal, scattered here and there, what was the species, and sometimes even construct the original animal, but he would feel grave doubts of the correctness of his construction if he ascertained that the remains had not been found in geological strata consistent with his theory. By a process very similar, a philosophical reader of the New Testament may construct the skeleton outline of the Church's organism established by the Apostles, if he be skilled in Jewish archæology, and proceeds without bias, or presuming that he knows all the reasons why it was transmitted to us in its present shape. But like the Naturalist, too, he must take care that the outline he has constructed can be reconciled with the historical facts of the post-Apostolic strata *in which it ought to have been found.*

In order to illustrate our subject as fully as possible, let us consider the analogy existing between the mode in which Church government is taught in the New Testament, and the mode in which important doctrine is revealed. Let us select the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ, and see how it is revealed in the New Testament. It is the greatest of Christian truths, and here, if anywhere, we might expect precise and explicit language. Yet no writer in the New Testament states

in express terms that Jesus Christ was God. It may be thought that if any fact needed explicit assertion, this cardinal fact demanded it. Yet, we repeat, no writer asserts it in any one undisputed text. If there were one such to be found, there would be no Unitarians who accept the New Testament as an inspired revelation. Why, then, do we believe that Jesus Christ is "very God of very God?" Because the whole tenor and scope of the New Testament leads us to the belief. Because the attributes and name of Jehovah are ascribed to him, at least, so we gather by a fair inference. Because on the supposition that He is God, the New Testament becomes plain and harmonized, while on the supposition that He is *not* God, it becomes inexplicable, so much so that the moment we doubt His Divinity we suspect his morality, and can scarcely avoid thinking Christianity an imposture. Because we know and feel that the writers do not so much attempt to prove, as take it for granted as proved, that He was God, and write as if they for whom they were writing took it for granted also. Because we know from historical sources that the contemporaries of the Apostles, and their immediate successors, believed in His Divinity; and inasmuch as they referred to no other authority than the books of the New Testament, they must have read in those books the Divinity of Christ. They who lived when Greek and Syriac were yet living and spoken languages, and who conse-

quently were able to see and appreciate far better than the most highly gifted moderns the force and meaning of these languages, saw in the New Testament the Divinity of Christ, or else they would not have professed it; and history tells us that they *did* profess it. Nay, more, all the world sees the same except (and here is the marvel) a few so-called Christians. The Jews see the Divinity of Christ in the New Testament Scriptures, and reject them for that very reason. The Mahometans, while acknowledging that He was the Messiah, reject His claim to Divinity, and for that reason reject the New Testament also, and take their account of Christianity from the "Gospel of Christ's Infancy," and the spurious "Gospel of St James." These are the principal reasons why we believe that Christ is revealed to us in the New Testament as God. And very similar are the reasons why we believe our system of Church government to be Scriptural and Apostolical. We think that the mode of reasoning whereby we prove that our Saviour was God, ought to be considered sufficient to prove that His Church was Episcopal, provided the proof be similar in each case. The similarity of the proof is very remarkable. No passage in the New Testament explicitly states that the Apostles established the Episcopal and three-fold Ministry as the invariable, universal law. Why, then, do we hold to it? Because the whole tenor and drift of the New Testament point that way. Because on the

supposition that the regimen of the Church was that of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, the Epistles are harmonized and intelligible, and the position and powers of such men as St. Timothy in Ephesus, and Titus in Crete become perfectly clear. Because on the supposition that the regimen of the Church was that of parity of Ministers, without subordination of various orders, we are utterly at a loss to know why so much of St. Paul's writings, which contain accounts of Presbyters and Deacons, and their qualifications, should have been put on record, with such commands as "stand fast and hold the traditions which ye have been taught whether by word or our Epistle;" and again, "For this cause have I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee." Because the contemporaries of the Apostles and their immediate successors appealed to no other authority than the New Testament, and yet undoubted historical testimony tells us that they established the Episcopal form of Church government and no other, everywhere; therefore they saw that form of Government in the Apostolic writings. Episcopacy was indisputably universal when the Canon of the New Testament was finally settled, and therefore must have been supposed to harmonize with it, or, surely, the Church, which had no other rule of faith than the New Testament, and no other rule of discipline than Episcopacy, would not have set its seal as a "witness and keeper," to a set of documents

which condemned its practice. Still further, the whole Christian world for full 1500 years, saw no other regimen in the New Testament ever since the days of those who lived when Greek was a living language, and who therefore understood St. Paul's writings as we can scarcely hope to do. But I need not press the analogy farther. My object is neither controversial nor polemical, but rather to persuade you that while "The things that were written aforetime were written for our learning," the learning which results from a knowledge of the general drift and scope of Scripture, is safer than the carping criticism (however learned) which demands for every item of doctrine or discipline, a specific command, a chapter and verse; in other words, it is the man who is imbued with the spirit of the Bible that is most likely to be orthodox in doctrine, and he who is best acquainted with the genius and history of Apostolic times, and can put himself in imagination there, will be most likely to be right on the question of Church order.

And here I may remark the providential wisdom of the Church of England in never having given exclusive sanction to any translation of the Holy Scriptures. In marked contrast to the course pursued by the Church of Rome, she values the spirit more than the letter of Scripture. The Church of Rome staked her infallibility on the correctness of the Vulgate Version, and we know that sufficient errors have been

detected in it, to require that it should be revised by order of one Pope after another. The Anglican Church is content with declaring the Scriptures as we have them, to be canonical, and that they contain all things necessary to salvation, but she does not specify any particular translation. She plainly means Holy Scripture in the original tongues. It is custom not law that binds us to the "*Authorized*" Version. It is true that the Lessons for the daily service are taken from it ; but other portions of Scripture used in Divine Service, and equally sanctioned by the Church, are taken from various versions. The Psalms, for instance, differ greatly from the authorized version, and agree, for the most part with the Septuagint, and not with the original Hebrew. The Offertory sentences, the Ten Commandments, and the "comfortable words" in the Communion office, are taken from some unknown version. The same may be said of the "Lord's Prayer," the "Benedictus," the "Magnificat," and the "Nunc dimittis." The other Canticles, the "Venite," the "Jubilate," "Cantate," and "Deus Misereatur," are taken from the great Bible of A.D. 1540, while the Introductory sentences, and the Epistles and Gospels, agree with the "Authorized version." No preference is thus given to any translation, to teach us that the infallible records have not been infallibly translated, and that our aim should be to get at the spirit that quickeneth, rather than the letter which killeth. Believing that the Holy

Scriptures were written for our learning, may God give us grace to prove it, by being diligent pupils who deem no part of them unimportant. Such learning has salvation for its end, but let us remember that exquisite pleasure attends it long before that Salvation is attained. Every motive which should actuate rational beings who desire to hold communion with Heaven, should urge us to search those Scriptures, that we may learn the original from which we fell, the probation in which we are, and the glory we shall inherit, through Jesus Christ our Saviour.

THE END

Feb. 20/30

